

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICERECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 01 2007

BRYAN-BROWN et al.

Atty. Ref.: 124-1062; Confirmation No. 8551

Appl. No. 10/775,342

TC/A.U. 2871

Filed: February 11, 2004

Examiner: Schechter, Andrew M.

For: A LIQUID CRYSTAL DEVICE EXHIBITING ZENITHAL BISTABILITY AND A CELL
WALL FOR SUCH A DEVICE

* * * * *

May 1, 2007

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION

In response to the Official Action dated February 1, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

In response to the double-patenting rejections outlined in the final action, Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for his helpful guidance provided in a telephone conversation on February 12, 2007. Applicants are following the recommendations provided by the Examiner in order to place the application in condition for allowance.

First, Applicants hereby submit a Terminal Disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent 7,053,975 to Wood which obviates the double-patenting rejections based on the Wood patent. Second, with respect to the double-patenting rejection based on the Tuffin, the undersigned has been informed that the Tuffin patent is currently not owned by ZBD Displays Limited, and that

BRYAN-BROWN et al.
Appl. No. 10/775,342
May 1, 2007

ZBD Displays Limited and QinetiQ Limited are different companies. Neither company is a wholly owned subsidiary of the other. Recall that Tuffin's effective filing date is many years after the effective filing date of the instant application. Third, since the double-patenting rejections based on Wood and Tuffin have been removed, the provisional double-patenting rejections should be withdrawn because this application is the earliest filed application, the other applications are still pending, and this application is currently in condition for allowance.


Applicants again appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 32-37 are allowed and that claims 17-31 and 36 would be allowable if the double-patenting rejections were overcome. As explained in the last office action, with respect to the Examiner's reasons for allowance, Applicants agree that the combination of features recited in each of these claims is patentable. To the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance are inconsistent with or add additional limitations to the claims, Applicants respectfully disagree because the claims define the invention.

The application is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____


John R. Lastova
Reg. No. 33,149

JRL:maa
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100